COPY

DEFENDANT'S
EXHIBIT

U.S. v. Moussaoui

Cr. No. 01-455-A

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA ALEXANDRIA DIVISION		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, . Criminal No. 1:01cr455		
4	vs. Alexandria, Virginia . April 22, 2005		
5	ZACARIAS MOUSSAOUI, 3:30 p.m.		
6	a/k/a Shaqil, a/k/a .		
7	Defendant		
8			
9	TO VICCOLDA OE DIEV IIEVETA		
	TRANSCRIPT OF PLEA HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEONIE M. BRINKEMA		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
11	APPEARANCES:		
12	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: PAUL J. McNULTY,		
13	United States Attorney ROBERT A. SPENCER, AUSA		
14	DAVID J. NOVAK, AUSA DAVID RASKIN, AUSA		
15	United States Attorney's Office 2100 Jamieson Avenue		
7.6	Alexandria, VA 22314		
16			
17	FOR THE DEFENDANT: ALAN H. YAMAMOTO, ESQ.		
18	108 N. Alfred Street, First Floor Alexandria, VA 22314-3032		
19			
20	ALSO PRESENT: FRANK W. DUNHAM, JR., Federal Public Defender		
21	GERARD FRANCISCO EDWARD B. MAC MAHON, ESQ.		
22	SPECIAL AGENT AARON ZEBLEY		
	GERALD THOMAS ZERKIN, Assistant Federal Public Defender		
23			
24	(Pages 1 - 34)		
25			
	COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION OF STENOGRAPHIC NOTES		

CAT# 1269

1	COURT	REPORTERS:
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

25

ANNELIESE J. THOMSON, RDR, CRR KAREN K. BRYNTESON, RMR, CRR U.S. District Court, Fifth Floor 401 Courthouse Square Alexandria, VA 22314 (703)299-8595

PROCEEDINGS 1 THE CLERK: Criminal Case 2001-455, United States of America v. Zacarias Moussaoui. Will counsel please note their appearance for the record. (Defendant present.) MR. SPENCER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Rob Spencer, 6 David Novak, David Raskin, and Paul McNulty for the United States. THE COURT: All right. 9 MR. YAMAMOTO: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Alan Yamamoto here with Mr. Moussaoui. Also in the courtroom are 10 Mr. Zerkin, Mr. Dunham, and Mr. MacMahon on behalf of 11 Mr. Moussaoui. 12 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Moussaoui, you are here as 13 well. 14 15 Mr. Moussaoui, the reason for this hearing this afternoon is it's the Court's understanding that you wish to enter 16 guilty pleas to the indictment. Is that still your desire? 17 18 THE DEFENDANT: Indeed I am.

THE COURT: All right. If you'd go up to the lectern, please.

Now, as you know from your previous appearances in court, the Court must place you under an affirmation to tell the truth.

THE DEFENDANT: It's understood.

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Moussaoui, you understand

```
that all answers to the Court's questions must be completely
    truthful and that if you should lie in answering any question, you
    could be prosecuted for a separate crime called perjury. Do you
    understand that?
              THE DEFENDANT: It is understood.
              THE COURT: It is understood, all right, sir.
 6
              For the record, what is your full name?
              THE DEFENDANT: My full name is Zacarias Moussaoui.
 8
              THE COURT: Have you also used the aliases or kunya
 9
10
   names that are listed in the indictment?
              THE DEFENDANT: Indeed. I use the name, my war name, my
11
12
    jihad name is Abu Khaled al Sahrawi, and my name in, in the
13
   western world is also Shaquil.
14
              THE COURT: All right, sir. And how old are you,
15
   Mr. Moussaoui?
16
              THE DEFENDANT: I'm born the 30th of May, 1968.
17
              THE COURT: And how much education have you received?
18
              THE DEFENDANT: I have a degree, a French degree in
    commerce and technology, I have qualified from the Institute of
19
20
   Export of London, and I have a Master Degree in International
21
   Business from the University of -- South Bank University in
22
   London.
23
              THE COURT: All right, sir. Are you presently being
24
    cared for by a doctor for any physical or mental condition?
25
              THE DEFENDANT: No, grace to the Lord.
```

```
THE COURT: Are you presently taking any medications for
    any physical or mental condition?
              THE DEFENDANT: No, grace to the Lord.
              THE COURT: And are you presently under the influence of
 4
    any alcohol or drugs?
 6
              THE DEFENDANT: No. I am Muslim. Grace to the Lord.
              THE COURT: All right. Now, Mr. Moussaoui, as you know,
 7
    the decision of a defendant to plead guilty is a decision that
    belongs to that defendant.
10
              THE DEFENDANT: Indeed.
              THE COURT: You understand that your lawyers are
11
    advising you against pleading guilty and are opposed to your
12
    decision?
13
14
              THE DEFENDANT: I have received the representation of
    your lawyer, and I have made this decision. I have maintained
15
    this decision to plead guilty to the indictment.
16
17
              THE COURT: All right, sir.
18
              Now, have you had a copy of the second superseding
19
    indictment in your possession since it was returned in July of
    2002?
20
21
              THE DEFENDANT: No, I do not have this copy. I only
22
   have the copy of the statement of fact.
23
              THE COURT: All right. But you did receive a copy of
24
   the indictment a long time ago.
25
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, indeed, a long time ago.
```

THE COURT: All right.

THE DEFENDANT: But I know very much what it's talking about.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I need to go over the indictment with you at this time, the specific charges that are included in the indictment, the maximum sentences to which you are exposed with any finding of guilt, and to make sure you understand what the elements would be that the government would have to prove if the case went to trial. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand this.

THE COURT: All right. Do you understand that Count 1 of the indictment charges you with being a member of a conspiracy to commit acts of terrorism transcending national boundaries resulting in death, that that is essentially Count 1 of the indictment? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand that Count 2 of the indictment charges you with conspiracy to commit aircraft piracy resulting in death? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: Count 3 charges you with conspiracy to destroy aircraft and with a death resulting from that conspiracy. Do you understand that charge?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Count 4 charges you with being a member of a

conspiracy to use weapons of mass destruction resulting in death. Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 3 THE COURT: Count 5 charges you with being a member of a 4 5 conspiracy to murder United States employees. Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. THE COURT: And lastly, do you understand that Count 6 8 charges you with being a member of a conspiracy to destroy 10 property? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 12 THE COURT: All right, sir. 13 Now, because of the way the counts are charged in the indictment -- and we've already provided you with a list of the 14 maximum penalties, you received that earlier this week, correct? 15 16 That's the one-page document that had the penalties listed on it? 17 I'm going to go over that with you again, but I just want to make 18 sure you remembered receiving that. 19 THE DEFENDANT: You are saying --20 THE COURT: Didn't you get a statement of facts? Did I not give you a statement of the penalties? 21 22 THE DEFENDANT: No, I did not -- he can confirm -- I did 23 not receive this, the -- talking about the, the penalty.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let me go over that with

you. But you've discussed those penalty provisions with

24

```
Mr. Yamamoto? That is, you are aware that the first four counts essentially expose you to the possibility of a death sentence or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole?
```

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I read the document. It was an old document about this penalty, the penalty that the government can impose on me. Yes, I read this.

THE COURT: All right. Just so you're clear on that, then Count 1, if it's found that your activity in the conspiracy resulted in death, exposes you to the possibility of death or life imprisonment without the possibility for parole. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do understand.

THE COURT: In addition, the Court could sentence you to up to five years of supervised release, a fine of up to \$250,000, and there's an automatic special assessment -- that's called a special fine -- of \$100. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. I wonder where I will get the money.

THE COURT: All right. Now, conspiracy -- Count 2 of the indictment, which is the conspiracy to commit aircraft piracy, again if a death results from the commission of the act, exposes you -- and, I'm sorry, in Count 1, that sentence, whatever sentence is imposed on Count 1 must run consecutive to any sentence imposed on any of the other counts in the indictment. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: And Count 2 again exposes you to the possible maximum penalty of death or life imprisonment without the possibility for parole. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do understand that.

THE COURT: In addition, again, there's up to five years of supervised release, there is a maximum fine of \$250,000, and there's a \$100 special assessment. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do understand that.

THE COURT: With Count 3, which is the conspiracy to destroy aircraft resulting in death, again the maximum penalty there could be death or life imprisonment without any possibility for parole, the same special assessment of -- special assessment of \$100, the same maximum fine of \$250,000, and the same period of supervised release, five years, applies to that count. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do understand that.

THE COURT: Count 4, which is the conspiracy to use weapons of mass destruction if resulting in death, again could result in a death sentence or any term of years life or death, but again, life or death is affected by whether a death results from that conspiracy, and if it's life imprisonment, it's without the possibility for parole. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do understand that.

THE COURT: Again, the fine would be up to \$250,000,

there's a five-year period of supervised release, and a \$100 automatic special assessment. Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do understand. THE COURT: With Count 5, which is the conspiracy to 4 murder United States employees, the maximum term of imprisonment is any term of years or life. There is no death penalty associated with Count 5. Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: I do understand that. 8 THE COURT: The maximum fine would be \$250,000. There is again a five-year period of supervised release and an automatic 10 \$100 special assessment. Do you understand that? 11 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do understand that. 13 THE COURT: And the last count, which is the conspiracy to destroy property, if death results as a proximate result of 14 15 conduct, then that could be up to life imprisonment followed by 16 five years of supervised release, a fine of up to \$250,000, and a special assessment of \$100. Do you understand that? 17 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do understand that. 19 THE COURT: The special assessments are cumulative. That means if you're found guilty of all six counts, there'd be a 20 total of \$600 in special assessments. Do you understand that? 21 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. 23 THE COURT: The supervised release portion of the 24 sentence doesn't begin until the imprisonment portion, if it's an

imprisonment sentence, begins to run. When a person is on

supervised release, he's under the control of a federal probation officer, and there may be requirements to do certain things as well as requirements not to do certain things.

If any condition of supervised release is violated, then the Court can sentence you to the period of -- to a period of incarceration which could be for as long as the period of supervised release, which is five years. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: You understand that parole is not available in the federal system? And again, with the first four counts in this case, parole would not be a possibility in any case, so whatever prison sentence is imposed, if one is imposed, will have to be served entirely. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do understand that.

THE COURT: Now, do you understand that you have a right to plead not guilty and to go to trial on any one or combination of or all of these charges in the indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: I do understand that.

THE COURT: All right. And it is the Court's understanding that you wish to bypass your right to go to trial on those charges and to enter guilty pleas to the six charges. Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: It is correct that I want to plead guilty to the six charge that face in the indictment. It's absolutely correct.

THE COURT: All right, sir.

Do you understand that if you pled not guilty and went to trial on Count 1, the government would have the burden of proving each and every one of the essential elements of that offense beyond a reasonable doubt?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that.

THE COURT: All right. And so what they would have to prove essentially is that the conspiracy as alleged in Count 1 of the indictment did, in fact, exist. No. 2, they'd have to prove that at some point during the life of the conspiracy, you knowingly and intentionally entered into acts in furtherance of the conspiracy, that you knew about the conspiracy, and that you purposely joined it. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that. That's what is contained in the statement of fact you're referring?

THE COURT: I'm just going through the elements right now.

THE DEFENDANT: All right.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the government would also have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that at least one act in furtherance of the conspiracy occurred in the Eastern District of Virginia? So, for example, the allegation that the Pentagon was one of the recipients of the -- or targets of the conspiracy would give this Court jurisdiction over the conspiracy. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand this.

THE COURT: And lastly, they'd have to prove that at least one of the specific overt acts that's listed in the indictment was committed either by you or by some other member of the conspiracy. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand this.

THE COURT: And they would similarly because all of the remaining five counts of the indictment are conspiracy counts have the same burden; that is, they'd have to prove as to each of the remaining five counts beyond a reasonable doubt that the specific conspiracy alleged in that indictment -- in that count of the indictment did, in fact, exist; that at some point during the life of the conspiracy you knowingly and intentionally joined into the conspiracy; that at least one act in furtherance of the conspiracy occurred in the Eastern District of Virginia; and that at least one of the listed overt acts in the indictment was committed either by you or by one of the named coconspirators in furtherance of that conspiracy. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that.

THE COURT: Now, if you went to trial, there would also be various rights and protections that you would have at trial that you're giving up with a guilty plea. First, you would be able to see and hear the government 's evidence, and you could test it through the cross examination of your attorneys. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: You could ask the Court to issue subpoenas.

Now, I know that that right has been limited to some degree in previous litigation in this case, but subject to that limitation, a defendant normally has a right and you would have a right to require that witnesses or physical evidence be brought to the courthouse that you could use in your defense. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do understand that.

THE COURT: You could testify as a witness if you went to trial. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: However, you could also invoke your Fifth Amendment right to remain silent and not testify, and if you remained silent at trial, no inference of guilt could be drawn from your silence. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: You would have the right to the help of a lawyer at all stages -- in fact, because this is a capital case, you have the right to at least two lawyers at all stages of the trial proceedings, and if you could not afford attorneys, they would be appointed for you. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: You would also have a right to choose how your case was tried. You could have a trial by a judge sitting

alone in what is called a bench trial or a trial by jury, in which case 12 people would be drawn from the community on a random basis to hear your case, but in either type of trial, you could not be convicted unless the government proved your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: If you continued with your not guilty pleas, your lawyers could continue to raise various defenses to the guilt phase of this trial. To the extent that there are any motions that are outstanding as to the guilt issue, you would be waiving or giving up your right to address any -- to waive -- I'm sorry, to argue any of those motions. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Can you repeat, please?

THE COURT: Yes. If the Court accepts your -- if you plead not guilty, you have a right, as you know, to file pretrial motions and to raise various legal issues or attacks on the prosecution as to the guilt phase. If the Court accepts your guilty plea today as to the guilt phase of this trial, you will have given up any of those attacks that you might have on the prosecution as it relates to the guilt phase. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: For thing what happened before, prior the guilty plea?

THE COURT: Yes, but to some -- I'm sorry, Mr. Yamamoto?

MR. YAMAMOTO: Go on, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Some of the issues that I think you are 1 concerned about in this case, such as access to certain witnesses' 2 testimony, is still highly relevant to the sentencing phase. THE DEFENDANT: That's why I was asking the question. 4 THE COURT: And you have not waived with this guilty plea any issues you might have as to what the Supreme Court ruled in that case, because the argument that I think has properly been made is that that evidence constitutes mitigating evidence. Mitigation is an extremely important factor at the penalty phase, and, therefore, that issue and some of those other issues that 10 relate to the penalty phase are not being waived in your guilty 11 plea to the guilt phase of the trial. 12 13 Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: So if I understand properly, I'm only 14 waiving thing what have happened prior the guilty plea regarding 15 16 the guilt phase, but for the sentencing phase, I will, I will still have the ability to raise issue to the Supreme Court? 17 18 THE COURT: Well, you -- people can't just jump to the Supreme Court. You still have legal issues that to the extent 19 they relate to the penalty phase of the trial, you are not by 20 21 pleading guilty giving up any of those issues. 22 THE DEFENDANT: That's what I'm saying. 23 THE COURT: That's what I'm saying, too. 24 (Discussion between Mr. Yamamoto and defendant off the

25

record.)

THE COURT: Mr. Moussaoui, do you understand what I have said?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. That's what I understood in the first place.

THE COURT: All right. That's fine.

And, lastly, if you pled not guilty and you went to trial and you were found guilty of the offense, you could appeal the finding of guilt to a higher level court. Now, do you understand that if the Court accepts your guilty pleas today, you will be found guilty of the six charges in the indictment, and you will not have a right to appeal the findings of guilt? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand this.

THE COURT: All right. Now, there was prepared for you a statement of facts. This is a five-page, 23-paragraph statement of facts, which I understand from our meeting two days ago that you went over yourself many times and you also consulted with Mr. Yamamoto about that statement of facts. Is that correct --

THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely.

THE COURT: -- Mr. Moussaoui?

All right. And you did bring to the Court's attention a change, a factual change you wanted made to paragraph 15, which had originally indicated a particular date that you felt was wrong, and so you should have before you the final statement of facts, which in statement 15 indicates that on August 2001, you

```
traveled to Minnesota, where you trained on a Boeing 747 400
    simulator at the Pan Am International Flight Academy in Eagan,
    Minnesota, and you told an al Qaeda associate that you would
    complete simulator training before September of 2001.
 5
              That was the correction you wanted made, correct, sir?
              THE DEFENDANT: Indeed it's correct.
 6
              THE COURT: All right. Now, Mr. Moussaoui, have you had
 7
 8
    enough time to carefully go over every factual allegation in that
    statement of facts?
 9
10
              THE DEFENDANT: I read more than ten times this
    statement of facts, and I've pondered about each paragraph, and I
11
12
    find it factual.
13
              THE COURT: And do you understand that by signing that
    statement of facts, if you do choose to sign it, and by telling
14
    the Court that you accept all of those statements of facts, you
15
   understand at the very beginning it indicates, "If this case were
16
    to go to trial, the government would prove the following facts
17
18
   beyond a reasonable doubt."
19
              If you sign that statement of facts and if I accept it,
20
   that will suffice to be a factual basis to find you quilty. Do
21
   you understand that?
22
              THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely. I do understand this.
23
              THE COURT: All right. Do you want to sign that
   document at this time?
24
```

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, indeed, I want.

```
THE COURT: All right.
              THE DEFENDANT: Finally I get a pen.
              THE COURT: I remembered your request from the other
 3
    day, Mr. Moussaoui.
 4
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: I just want to check it out.
              THE COURT: Yes, sir. Please, take your time.
 6
              (Pause)
              THE DEFENDANT: Can I sit down to sign?
              THE COURT: Yes, sir, you may. And if you want to talk
 9
10
    with Mr. Yamamoto, please feel free to consult with him.
11
              THE DEFENDANT: I think we have talk enough.
12
              THE COURT: All right. If you'd hand it up to Mr. Wood,
13
   please.
14
             Now, Mr. Moussaoui, you understand that you have
    absolutely no plea agreement of any kind with the United States
15
16
    government; is that correct?
17
              THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely correct.
              THE COURT: Has anybody promised or suggested to you in
18
19
    any respect that by pleading guilty, you might get a lighter
20
    sentence or more favorable treatment by the Court?
21
              THE DEFENDANT: No, at all. I can't expect anything.
22
              THE COURT: Excuse me?
23
              THE DEFENDANT: I can't expect any leniency from the
   American.
24
             THE COURT: All right. Do you understand that if the
25
```

```
Court accepts your guilty pleas today, there will be no further
    trial of the issue of guilt, you will not be able to come back and
    try to refute any of the facts in the statement of facts, and you
    will be found guilty today? Do you understand that?
              THE DEFENDANT: I understand that these statements of
 5
    fact is there to stay and I cannot go back and say no.
              THE COURT: All right. And just for the record, when
    you appeared before me earlier this week, is it not correct that
    you were not in shackles, stun belt, or any other kind of
10
    restraints on you? Is that correct?
11
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it's correct.
              THE COURT: And the same thing today, correct?
12
13
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
              THE COURT: Has -- do you feel in any respect that
14
    anyone has put any force or pressure on you to plead guilty today?
15
16
              THE DEFENDANT: To plead guilty? Absolutely not.
17
              THE COURT: All right. Then, sir, for the record, as to
    Count 1, which is conspiracy to commit acts of terrorism
18
19
    transcending national boundaries resulting in death, how do you
20
   plead?
21
              THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
22
              THE COURT: As to Count 2, conspiracy to commit aircraft
23
   piracy resulting in death, how do you plead?
24
              THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
25
              THE COURT: As to Count 3, conspiracy to destroy
```

```
aircraft resulting in death, how do you wish to plead?
              THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
              THE COURT: As to Count 4, conspiracy to use weapons of
    mass destruction resulting in death, how do you plead?
 4
              THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
 5
              THE COURT: As to conspiracy to murder United States
 6
    employees, how do you plead?
              THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
 8
              THE COURT: And as conspiracy -- Count 6, conspiracy to
 9
10
    destroy property, how do you plead?
              THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
11
12
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. Yamamoto --
13
              MR. YAMAMOTO: Yes, Your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: -- I know that the defendant is pleading
15
    guilty against the advice of all counsel, but you have been the
    only attorney who has been able to communicate with Mr. Moussaoui.
16
   Are you satisfied that his guilty pleas today have been made after
17
18
    careful consideration by the defendant?
19
             MR. YAMAMOTO: Your Honor --
              THE COURT: Mr. Moussaoui, sit down for a second.
20
   Your -- I do have to have Mr. Yamamoto on the record.
21
22
             MR. YAMAMOTO: Your Honor, I think we filed a pleading
23
   with the Court today at some point. I don't know if the Court
24
   has --
25
             THE COURT: I understand that, but when you have dealt
```

with Mr. Moussaoui about this plea, and you're the only lawyer who has talked with him about this over the last two or three weeks, has he understood the legal ramifications of guilty pleas?

MR. YAMAMOTO: When I've spoken to him, Your Honor, we have discussed the ramifications of the guilty plea and the fact that he has -- he is facing the possibility of death and the possibility of life imprisonment. He has told me that he understands that.

THE COURT: And you're satisfied that he understands that?

MR. YAMAMOTO: In speaking with him, he's -- we've argued about it, and he indicates that -- well, he understands it. We've gone around in circles. It started out differently initially as to what he was looking for, so he appears to understand it, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I know it puts you in a difficult position because all counsel in this case are opposed to the defendant's decision, but we all know that the law allows a defendant who is competent the absolute right to determine his own fate as to key issues in a criminal case, the most critical of which is whether to plead guilty or not guilty.

MR. YAMAMOTO: He has responded appropriately when I've spoken to him. He has had disagreements with me with respect to certain items. Those disagreements were appropriate disagreements.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

All right, Mr. Moussaoui, come back to the lectern.

I have previously found based upon a rather unusual hearing that was done on the record with Mr. Moussaoui and Mr. Yamamoto present that I am fully satisfied that Mr. Moussaoui is completely competent to enter his guilty pleas today. The defendant has acted against the advice of his counsel, but he has clearly exhibited both today and earlier this week a complete understanding of the ramifications of his guilty pleas.

Mr. Moussaoui is an extremely intelligent man. He has actually a better understanding of the legal system than some lawyers I've seen in court. I reread the transcript from the plea hearing of two-and-a-half years ago, and he understands -- understood then and I have no reason to believe he does not understand now the nature of conspiracy law.

The full reasons for my finding the defendant competent, I think, are adequately expressed in the transcript of that hearing, which will be released sometime today to make the record more complete, but I am satisfied, Mr. Moussaoui, that you have entered these guilty pleas in a knowing and voluntary fashion. You have intentionally disregarded the advice of counsel. That is your right in our legal system.

The Court is also satisfied that the written statement of facts which you have had several days to carefully go over and you have had the advice and consultation of Mr. Yamamoto is more

than sufficient evidence to establish your guilt beyond a 1 reasonable doubt as to all six counts. 3 Is there anything, counsel for the government, Mr. Spencer, that I may have omitted in this Rule 11 colloquy that you need put on the record? MR. SPENCER: Two points, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Yes, sir. MR. SPENCER: First is I think the defendant ought to be given a warning that a -- as part of his sentence, he could be ordered to pay restitution to victims. And the second, Your 10 Honor, I've asked to clarify for the record that in paragraph 15, 11 where I understand Mr. Moussaoui requested a change to the 12 statement of facts, he changed the second date, that is, the date 13 September 2001, not the first date that appears in paragraph 15. 14 15 Correct. I thought I had read that into the THE COURT: 16 record. 17 Mr. Moussaoui, in paragraph -- Mr. Moussaoui, in 18 paragraph 15, you did not change the first date, the August 2001 19 date. You simply changed the second date. 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, indeed. 21 THE COURT: Yes. All right. 22 MR. SPENCER: Thank you, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: And, Mr. Moussaoui, there can be the

possibility, I have to just legally tell you this, of having to

make restitution to any and all of the victims in this case.

24

you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand what you're saying.

THE COURT: All right. As I said then, the Court is accepting today the six -- the defendant's six pleas of guilty to the six counts in the indictment. I'm fully satisfied he is competent to enter these pleas, the facts support them, and you are found quilty at this time.

Now, the next step in this case is there are outstanding motions on the threshold factors that qualify these convictions for capital punishment. That requires the Court to address motions raising legal issues. Some of that has been already briefed, but in the passage of time and the significant change in the evidence in this case, I am going to give defense counsel leave to file supplementary motions if you feel you need to on the issue of the death notice, and the government will have an opportunity to respond to that, and we will most likely have a hearing on that issue, and that will be sometime in the future. I'm going to let counsel consult with each other to determine a briefing schedule for that matter.

And the last thing is -- Mr. Moussaoui, you may have a seat because we are finished with the proceeding.

THE DEFENDANT: I just want to say because you mentioned that the, the transcript of the, of the hearing on Wednesday -THE COURT: Correct.

THE DEFENDANT: -- were to be released.

THE COURT: I thought you had no objection to that.

THE DEFENDANT: And I have significantly changed my position following the advice I receive from you and certain information I come to realize regarding the death penalty, because on Wednesday, I did mention to you that I intended to plead for the death penalty, and you explained to me the process I was going to undergo. And you did send me the transcript of this hearing, and you gave me the opportunity to really understand fully the process of the sentencing phase.

And also I come to understand a few other thing by going through the different information that I receive from, from the lawyer, mainly relating to the Blackledge/Perry case, okay, but what I am saying is I will not apply for death. And, in fact, I will fight every inch against the death penalty, okay?

I need to say this at this point because if somebody is reading the transcript of, of Wednesday, the 20th, you will have the impression that Moussaoui is applying for death now, and that -- for some reason that will be too long to express now, okay, why I was doing this, but now I can say to, to you and to the lawyer and to the public that, no, Moussaoui will fight every inch against the death penalty.

And I have -- I want to file this motion regarding the ineffective assistance of defense counsel relating to some issue of the guilty plea because I've been misled by the defense counsel relating to what I could do after pleading guilty.

Basically, they say that I --

THE COURT: Mr. Moussaoui, I don't want to stop you but I'm going to because it's not appropriate to discuss in public attorney-client communications.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not going to say anything about what they say.

THE COURT: All right.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm going just to say what I understand from the, the, the publicly available case, <u>Blackledge v. Perry</u>, okay, where the Supreme Court laid down the rule for defendant, what he can do after pleading guilty. And the Supreme Court said in the <u>Blackledge v. Perry</u> case he may not thereafter, thereafter a guilty plea, raise independent claim relating to the deprivation of constitutional right that occur prior to the entry of the guilty plea.

So initially I understand that was it. I could not make any claim after my guilty plea, but the fact of the matter, the new, the new substitution ordered by the Court of Appeals have not occur prior the entry of the guilty plea. They have not been written. And this is a fact.

So I will be able because of what may be or I believe is a legal loophole, maybe raise issue relating to this new substitution who have not occur happen, been written prior the entry of the guilty plea, okay? And this lawyer have not been giving me this advice.

Not only this, okay, I have not been -- this Dunham have been going to the press saying that Mr. Moussaoui is incompetent, okay, to plead guilty for 9/11. And I'm afraid that this statement of fact and Mr. Dunham or the prosecution, the government, will point out to me a single paragraph where they say that I'm guilty of 9/11.

I ask the government to point out to me a single paragraph where they say I am specifically guilty of 9/11 -- THE COURT: All right.

THE DEFENDANT: -- because the government had said that there is a broader conspiracy to use airplane as weapon of mass destruction. If that's absolutely correct, that I came to the United States of America to be part, okay, of a conspiracy to use airplane as a weapon of mass destruction, I was being trained on the 747 400 to eventually use this plane as stated in this statement of fact to strike the White House, but this conspiracy was a different conspiracy that 9/11.

My conspiracy has for aim to free Sheikh Omar Abdel Rahman, Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman, the blind sheikh, who is held in Florence, Colorado, okay, and we wanted to use the 747 because it, it is a long-distance plane who could reach Afghanistan without any stopover to give a chance to special forces to storm the plane.

So I am guilty of a broad conspiracy to use weapon of mass destruction to hit the White House if the American government

refuse to negotiate, okay.

So by -- Mr. Dunham is pretending to want to defend me, but, in fact, he's acting like a Judah, okay, going to everybody saying that Moussaoui is incompetent because Moussaoui should not plead guilty for 9/11, but as I said before, okay, you can point to me -- you can't point to me a single statement here which say Mr. Moussaoui came into the United States to participate into the 9/11, okay, and that's not my conspiracy.

So that's what I want to put in the death phase as a mitigating factor to the jury. I don't want them to pretend that I have a minor part in 9/11 because you know very well the law of conspiracy was enacted by your government -- by your Congress to reject the idea that in drug cartel you could have a minor part because if somebody were to drive a truck full of chemical to process, to manufacture a drug, he could not say: Oh, I only drive a truck full of chemical. This chemical is illegally bought. No. The Congress and your government have enacted the law to say no, mister, you are part of a drug cartel, and this chemical have been drove to manufacture a drug, so you are guilty of this.

So when Mr. Dunham is saying Mr. Moussaoui have a minor participation of -- in the conspiracy, he is pleading for death for me because there is not such a thing as a minor participation into a conspiracy, okay?

Not only this Mr. Dunham is doing; Mr. Dunham is

agreeing to substitution. He have written in his pleading that he wanted to agree to substitution, but substitution are no more than stipulation. Substitution are no more than stipulation, where the government and the so-called defense lawyer are sitting together and agreeing on some event of were meant to have happened.

In my case, they are going to sit down and agree that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, Ramzi Binalshibh, and Mustafa have make certain statement, and they will have to agree, and you will have to sanction.

It is exactly the same as exactly 100 percent as stipulation. And to enter a stipulation, the law is clear that you need the consent of the accused, and I'm vehemently, adamantly against this, okay, that they should not enter any substitution so-called in fact stipulation against my will because I want to preserve the issue of substitution for my appeal because you can, you can really imagine when the government will bring the victim impact story and many thing to the jury, what is going to weight, a CIA piece of paper of substitution stating that Mr. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed say this? What is going to weight in front of a jury? Nothing.

Whereas by preserving, by not accepting the substitution, by saying that we are going to follow what you have said, the judge, that this substitution were inadequate, unfair, it was not giving me a fair trial, and you restate, put this aside, okay, and we are not agreeing to anything with the

government and we present the case that I have been saying that I was part of a different conspiracy in the sentencing phase, is then this preserve my chance in front of the Supreme Court to, to raise the issue of substitution and to raise the issue of fair trial.

THE COURT: All right.

that.

THE DEFENDANT: Because the, the, the Supreme Court might take the view to say to me, Mr. Moussaoui, indeed you have some points here, but the fact that your defense counsel have agreed to the substitution by itself speaks that somehow it was possible to find an agreement, and you have said that it was unfair in your memorandum. You have said clearly this, okay?

So I don't see why on earth they will insist on doing

THE COURT: Mr. Moussaoui, wait. I'm going to -- I know you wanted to say something. I'm going to stop you at this point for this reason. These are, in fact, issues that are going to be addressed, but this is not the time or place. I want -- I'm asking --

THE DEFENDANT: I have not a chance to have my voice being speak because they know that I've being held in this cave, in Alexandria Detention cave, and nobody speaking for Moussaoui, okay? And this is my last time, I'm sure, that I have the opportunity because I am not my lawyer.

The only reason I have the right to speak today is

because I'm pleading guilty. Otherwise, I will be silenced.

THE COURT: Mr. Moussaoui --

THE DEFENDANT: And I will be silenced in a few seconds because you will say whatever you are going to say, and you are going to shut my mouth, and you are going to run your, your show, okay?

And these people are not effectively defending me for many reason. They don't want to file to the Supreme Court using this potential loophole. They don't want to file contesting the validity of what the Court of Appeals have say because as I just said to you, it is, in fact, stipulations that you want to put in my mouth, okay, to make me agree against my will, okay, and not only this, okay, they don't want to present in the death phase my version of events that I was not part of 9/11, okay?

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Moussaoui.

THE DEFENDANT: So I don't see how on earth I'm receiving effective assistance of defense lawyer except that Dunham, he have his day with the journalists, you know, going around and saying Moussaoui is crazy, Moussaoui is crazy. He's crazy to want to defend his life, that's what he's crazy for, an ex-prosecutor, who is doing the job of the prosecution by the minor door, by the back door, okay, Mr. ex-Prosecutor Dunham.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Moussaoui, thank you. Step down, please.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I will step down.

THE COURT: Now, I want to follow up, frankly, on something Mr. Moussaoui --

THE DEFENDANT: Everybody know that I'm not 9/11 material.

THE COURT: I understand that. Have a seat, please.

Now, I do want to follow up on a very serious point Mr. Moussaoui has said, and that is that there has been way too much discussion in the media about this case. Our local criminal rule 57.1(C) and (G) make it quite clear that counsel are not to make extrajudicial statements about a criminal case, including such things as commenting on the merits of issues, and competency of a defendant is a critical issue in a case.

Also, I think it is absolutely appalling that people are talking about the contents of sealed hearings and then saying, "Oh, but I can't have my name attributed because it's under seal." "Under seal" means you don't talk about it at all, and it has to stop in this case.

Now, I don't want to put a complete gag order on everybody. There are times when there are some mild statements that are necessary to keep the public and the press informed, but I do not want to see again in any media any attribution to sources close to the case or to counsel themselves directly commenting upon pleadings that are about to be filed, commenting upon issues in this case. It has to stop.

This is a serious case. There are genuinely nuanced

fact situations that involve this particular defendant. He has a right to an absolutely fair trial on the issue of his penalty, and it cannot go on like a circus. If I see any more what I think are inappropriate leaks, 4 I'm going to ask the FBI to start an investigation, and this one I'm going to stay on. That applies to both the government and the defense team. Unless there's anything further, we're recessing court 8 for the day. Mr. Spencer, anything further? MR. SPENCER: No, thank you, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right, recess court. 11 12 (Which were all the proceedings 13 had at this time.) 14 15 CERTIFICATE OF THE REPORTERS 16 We certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 Karen K. Brynteson 24